DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 448 SO 012 116

AUTHOR Fenton, Edwin
TITLE The Relationship of Citizenship Education to Values Education. Occasional Paper No. 2.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 77
CONTRACT 400-76-0043
NOTE 37p.
AVAILABLE FROM Research for Better Schools, Inc., 444 North Third Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123 ($2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship; Cognitive Development; *Curriculum Planning; Democratic Values; Educational Alternatives; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Interpersonal Competence; Moral Development; *Skill Development; *Values

ABSTRACT

The paper, presented in four sections, draws a distinction between citizenship education and values education. Section I defines the six major goals of citizenship education: the development of participatory skills and of intellectual skills; growth in knowledge of facts, concepts, and generalizations; personal development; development of dramatic values; and citizenship action both in and outside of school. Section II describes four programs of values education which relate to citizenship goals: values analysis, values clarification, cognitive moral development, and the organization of alternative educational programs. Section III discusses the values programs in relation to the citizenship goals. The author concludes that while each of the programs contribute to some of the goals, the most effective programs of citizenship action are not part of the four major programs discussed. The final section outlines the elements of a comprehensive citizenship education program: it should extend over many years of schooling and well beyond the social studies courses; it must change the hidden curriculum as well as the overt curriculum; it must include an intensive, long-term teacher preparation program; new curricular materials, particularly in social studies and English must be acquired; and the comprehensive program must be carefully evaluated. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178448

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION TO VALUES EDUCATION. OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 2

by

Edwin Fenton

Publication No. BJ-9

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ulik Rouk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

January, 1977

SO 012 116

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION TO VALUES EDUCATION

OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 2

EDWIN FENTON
Carnegie-Mellon (University) Education Center

PLANNING FOR MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION
RUSSELL A. HILL, Director
JOAN D. WALLACE, Editor

WINTER 1977

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.
SUITE 1700/1700 MARKET STREET/PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education is funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE).

Published by RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC., a private non-profit corporation. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-76-0043 with the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Foreword

In this paper Edwin Fenton, a prominent figure in moral/ethical/values education, draws a distinction between citizenship education and values education. He outlines major goals of civic education, describes four programs of values education, explores the relationship between the two fields, comments on funding possibilities, and, finally, makes recommendations for organizing citizenship-education programs. In so doing, Dr. Fenton illuminates and redefines a broad terrain which has occasionally suffered from interchangeable terminology, problems of territoriality, and conceptual confusion. The paper thus lends clarity to a domain which is experiencing a resurgence of excitement and dedication.

Dr. Fenton is director of the Carnegie-Mellon (University) Education Center. He received the Ph.D. degree in history from Harvard University. He has taught at Carnegie-Mellon University since 1964, where he has also held a variety of administrative posts. In addition, Dr. Fenton has served as a consultant to a number of agencies and foundations, both here and abroad. During 1974-75, through Danforth Foundation support, he spent a leave of absence at Harvard University to work with Lawrence Kohlberg's cognitive-developmental approach to moral education. Dr. Fenton has written numerous articles on teaching and curriculum development; has authored, coauthored, and edited several books; produced curricular materials and teaching films; and contributed to many conferences, symposia, and seminars.

Dr. Fenton's manuscript represents the second in a series of Occasional Papers emanating from a year-long project entitled Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education (a term which

has since been more accurately defined as ethical-citizenship education [ECE]). The project, carried out by Research for Better Schools under contract with the National Institute of Education (NIE), had as its primary objective to develop R, D, and D ECE recommendations for submission to NIE and the public. A series of informational publications, of which this paper is one, is intended to feed into and promote an exchange of knowledge, ideas, and creativity among those engaged in ECE endeavors.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION TO VALUES EDUCATION

Edwin Fenton
Carnegie-Mellon University

Three major national crises -- the civil rights movement of the 1960s, the war in Vietnam, and Watergate -- have focused the attention of both educators and the wider public on citizenship education and values education. As a consequence, the meaning of these two terms has become confused, and the distinction between them blurred. This paper defines citizenship education by specifying six sets of goals to which most civic educators would probably subscribe, describes four popular schools of values education, examines the relationships between these two areas of American education, and makes recommendations about funding.

Six Goals of Citizenship Education

No consensus exists about the appropriate goals of citizenship education. In 1975 the Kettering Foundation and the Danforth Foundation jointy set up a National Task Force on Citizenship Education. This Task Force commissioned a number of papers by experts in the field. Each paper stressed a somewhat different aspect of citizenship education, such as better understanding of the function of law, the application of new knowledge from political science to educational programs, the development of citizen-action programs in the schools, and the application of ideas from developmental psychology to preparation for citizenship. Although the authors of these papers emphasized different courses or programs, they struck similar chords. Perhaps most of them would be willing to accept the statements describing the six goals for citizenship education which follow, although each would certainly state these goals in his or her own words and arrange them in

different orders of priority. The goals are the development of participatory skills; the development of intellectual skills; growth in knowledge of facts, concepts, and generalizations; personal development; the development of democratic values; and citizenship action both in and outside of school.

Participatory Skills

Participatory skills refer to the skills which a person needs in order to function effectively in a democratic pluralistic society such as ours. There are a large number of such skills; the list which follows is by no means exhaustive. Among the most important participatory skills are:

- the ability to read at least at the minimal level required to gather political, social, and economic information from newspapers, magazines, and government documents
- the ability to write at least at the minimal level required to communicate effectively in a civic organization or to fill out forms such as job applications or income tax statements
- the ability to gather information by listening to a speaker in a meeting, hearing a discussion, or listening to a radio or television broadcast
- the ability to communicate orally by stating one's opinion in a discussion or giving a short speech about a subject
- the ability to contribute constructively to meetings of civic or governmental organizations
- the ability to assume a position of leadership in a civic organization in such roles as chairperson, secretary, or treasurer
- the ability to negotiate and work out compromises

- the ability to influence key decision-makers through personal intervention or by participating in organizations whose functions include influencing decision-makers

Each of these skills must be carefully taught. Hence they ought to become specific objectives of many school courses. Reading and writing excepted, however, most schools slight participatory skills. In addition, many citizen groups define participatory skills too narrowly. How many people who favor a "return to basics" stress listening or speaking skills or other basic political skills, e.g., contributing constructively to meetings, conducting meetings, or learning how to influence decision-makers? Redefining education partly in terms of the requirements for constructive citizenship may help to broaden our definition of basic education in a democratic society. Modest funding would make this redefinition possible.

Intellectual Skills

Intellectual skills are primarily problem-solving abilities, often called analytical-inquiry skills by advocates of the new social studies projects of the 1960s. Here is a statement of one such inquiry process.

A MODE OF INQUIRY FOR PUBLIC-POLICY PROBLEMS

1. Define the problem to be solved. This process includes understanding the problem thoroughly, deciding what goals should be reached, and recognizing the values implied in the decision.
2. State all possible ways to reach the goals.
3. Gather information carefully, making sure that it is accurate and represents all points of view.
4. Evaluate carefully the probable effects that each possible solution might have, discarding those that seem impractical or harmful in the process.

5. In the light of Steps 3 and 4, choose the policy that appears likely to achieve most of the proposed goals.
6. Review the choice to see whether the setting of the problem has changed and whether the goals and values of the decision-makers have remained the same.

These intellectual skills are essential for full participation in any civic organization or for serious consideration of any proposed civic or governmental program. They are not easy to learn. First, they require that a person be able to reason at what Piaget defines as full formal operational thought -- the ability to hypothesize, to see all possibilities in a situation, to relate evidence to inference, and so forth. According to one study, only about half of American adults reason at the full formal operational level. Second, these skills require a full societal perspective, i.e., they require that one have the ability to see a situation from the point of view of all of the participants involved -- oneself, a farmer in Kansas, a labor union member in Birmingham, a politician in Washington, and so forth. A large percentage of high school students lack this full societal perspective. Third, they require a sophisticated understanding of social science concepts, which many students also lack.

Knowledge

Knowledge refers to facts, concepts, and generalizations about the American political, economic, and social systems and how they work. A full list of such essential knowledge would fill a book; hence I will not attempt to specify knowledge outcomes in this short paper, although many of the papers commissioned by the National Task Force on Citizenship Education stressed this vital goal. Instead I shall emphasize some of the

difficulties involved in teaching useful knowledge of our political, economic, and social systems.

Given time and effort, most students can memorize lists of facts, concepts, and generalizations. Many students at their present state of cognitive development, however, cannot understand fully what they have committed to memory. For example, they can memorize key paragraphs from the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. But these documents are based on a sophisticated level of thought about civic affairs well beyond the comprehension of all but a minority of high school students. Hence, teaching knowledge in a sophisticated sense implies a careful program of studies designed to facilitate the development of higher levels of civic understanding in the entire school population over many years of concentrated effort. The fourth section of this paper discusses this subject.

Personal Development

Personal development refers to the growth of self-knowledge, the development of self-esteem, and the growth of a sense of personal identity anchored firmly in family, ethnic or racial group, religious affiliation, community, nation, and common membership in the human race. This personal development is essential for citizenship in American society. Persons must know what they believe in order to function with full effectiveness. They must have self-esteem in order to feel that they are important, that others should listen to their opinions, and that they have full rights which should be respected. And all of us must develop personal identities in order to feel securely anchored in our rapidly changing society, a society from which so many have become alienated.

Most educational programs in American schools neglect personal development. It does not fit neatly within any discipline, such as mathematics, social studies, or English;

yet it must take place within traditional courses if it is to affect every student. Most educators neither understand why schools should devote time to personal development nor know how to foster self-knowledge, self-esteem, and personal identity in students. Without personal development, other aspects of citizenship education may be ineffective. Of what utility are increased knowledge and intellectual skills if their possessors lack the self-knowledge, the ego, and the commitment to act on their own convictions in constructive ways?

The Development of Democratic Values

Democratic values refer to the principles upon which democratic society is based: justice, the dignity and worth of the individual, equality, liberty commensurate with the equal liberty of all others, and the greatest good for the greatest number. This particular list of principles has been derived from the research of Lawrence Kohlberg and his colleagues, discussed later in this paper. It is compatible with the principles in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, our two basic civic documents, and with the writings and speeches of many of our greatest national leaders.

These principles are exceedingly difficult to teach so that students truly understand their original meaning and are able to use them in their daily lives. Many schools ask students to memorize principles such as these, and teachers often use these terms as if their students understood them. But as the section of this paper on cognitive moral development will explain, these principles define Stage 5 and Stage 6 thought on the Kohlberg scale, and only a tiny minority of students leave high school with a thought pattern higher than Stage 4. Hence, they are not able to understand these democratic principles in their full meaning. Only a carefully devised course of study extending over many years, involving

both the overt and the hidden curriculum, can bring these principles within the grasp of substantial portions of our secondary school youth. What goal is more important for the future of democratic society?

Citizenship Action

Citizenship action refers to opportunities to practice responsible citizenship either in schools or in the wider community. On the whole, students study about democracy and citizenship, but they get few opportunities to practice either one in meaningful ways. Most student governments have few real powers. Perceptive students look on student councils as instruments by which the administration gets its way and controls dissenters. In addition, the walls of the school cut students off from the real society in the towns and villages where they live. They get little experience as part of their schooling with civic activities in the wider, out-of-school community. Without this experience, they cannot be expected to transfer the principles they learn in civics class to their daily lives. Learning how to negotiate from a textbook is a far different matter than conducting negotiations in real life in order to attain a vital civic goal. Studying leadership in the abstract differs substantially from learning to choose a real-life leader. And learning Roberts' Rules of Order is an insufficient preparation for conducting the meetings of a labor union, a chamber of commerce, or a church vestry.

The most direct way to get students involved in civic affairs is to offer them opportunities to participate in meaningful student government and to become involved in actual civic organiations. Substantial barriers now stand in the way of these developments. Many school administrators, teachers, and parents do not want to give student governments meaningful powers. Many civic organizations are not organized to absorb

student interns or to provide useful jobs for students. Yet civic education cannot succeed fully until students learn to practice what their teachers preach.

Four Programs of Values Education

Programs of values education have grown rapidly since the end of World War II. These programs are quite diverse and differ somewhat in goals. Some, such as the Magic Circle, stress students' feelings; others, such as values analysis and cognitive moral development, focus attention on ways to think about values issues; still others, values clarification for one, emphasize both feeling and thinking. The educational techniques which these programs endorse also vary widely. For example, some recommend that teachers accept students' feelings and judgments, while others emphasize cognitive conflict. They vary in the degree of change within a school system required for their adoption. Some ask only that educators include new topics in conventional courses to employ a different discussion skill; others recommend that the entire educational process be reorganized. They also differ in the grade level for which they are intended. Some have utility only in elementary school; others can be used throughout precollegiate education; others apply only to secondary schooling; a few have been used in both schools and college.

In one way or another, each of these programs of values education has implications for citizenship education. None of them, of course, presents a full program of citizenship education, but each one touches upon one or more of the goals of citizenship education outlined in this paper. Four of these values programs have particular pertinence for citizenship because each relates to several citizenship goals. They are values analysis; values clarification; cognitive moral develop-

ment; and the organization of alternative educational programs, often with curricula which extend into the wider community outside of the school building. The second section of this paper discusses each of these four programs in values education.

Values Analysis

Values analysis refers to a number of programs of values education which have a common focus on the analysis of values in real-life situations. Most advocates of values analysis start with an incident presented as a dilemma: Should Susan B. Anthony stop working for feminism in order to devote her time and energy to the Union cause during the Civil War? They then suggest that the analysis should focus on this issue. Here are guidelines presented by one member of this approach:

- Clarify what the values conflict is about.
- Ask for facts.
- Ask for alternatives.
- Ask for consequences of each alternative.
- Ask for evidence to support the likelihood of each alternative occurring.
- Ask for an evaluation of the desirability of likely consequences.
- Ask for a judgment as to which alternative seems best, and why (Ubbelohde & Fraenkel, 1976, p. 202).

Values analysis employs teacher-led discussions as its major pedagogical technique. Most values analysis takes place within traditional courses such as history or civics and does not require that separate courses be set up or that schools reorganize their administrative structure. Most of the classroom interaction is from teacher to student, although creative teachers find many ways to foster student-to-student interaction. In any case, attention focuses on deciding what to

do -- or which alternative to choose -- rather than on the reasons for the choice, the major emphasis of cognitive moral development.

Values analysis focuses on the development of intellectual skills. The guidelines outlined above closely parallel the mode of inquiry for public-policy issues cited earlier except that the question for decision asks what persons should do instead of what policy they should adopt. Values analysis is also useful for attaining knowledge goals, learning some participatory skills, and developing democratic values.

Critics of values analysis allege that it has the following four major shortcomings. First, its proponents assume that students are capable of full formal operational thought on the Piagetian scale, although there is abundant evidence that this assumption is false. Second, values analysis ignores research about the developmental stages of moral and civic thought which indicates that the responses of students to what a person should do in a situation will be determined largely by the stage of their thought no matter what other alternatives are presented at stages higher or lower than their own. Third, many students are bored by values analysis, partly because some of them cannot meet its intellectual demands and partly because it can be repetitious. Finally, litte research has been done to relate the effects of values analysis in the classroom to the thought patterns and activities of students outside of school.

Values Clarification

Values clarification refers to the large variety of classroom techniques based on one or more steps in a seven-step process by which its advocates claim that persons arrive at values. These steps are choosing freely, choosing from among alternatives, choosing after thoughtful consideration of the

consequences of each alternative, prizing and cherishing, affirming, acting upon choices, and acting repeatedly. The major work in the field is Raths, Harmin, and Simon's (1969) Values and Teaching, a volume which has been supplemented by a large number of publications, many focusing on descriptions of classroom activities. Two-day workshops and books for teachers written in simple language have helped to disseminate values-clarification techniques until this system is probably the best-known program of values education in American schools.

Values-clarification exercises employ a wide variety of techniques. Most of them involve full class discussions. Values clarifiers have published many volumes to indicate how their ideas can be employed in traditional courses as well as in special courses or units. The discussions actively involve students who work in groups of various sizes and compositions, often featuring student-to-student interaction. The wide variety of pedagogical arrangements developed by advocates of values clarification help to maintain student interest and provide models for other values educators to adopt for different goals.

Many values-clarification exercises focus on self-knowledge, helping students to identify what they believe and to think about these beliefs. Others focus on self-esteem, helping students to identify what is good about themselves and to state what they like about their personalities, beliefs, or behaviors. Through questions called clarifying responses, teachers who use values-clarification techniques can encourage students to think about values choices.

Critics of values clarification raise a number of issues, four of them particularly important. First, the claim that values can be derived only through a seven-step process does not accord with social science knowledge, since it implies

that people who live in traditional societies and accept the standards of the past without challenge have no values. Second, it implies that all values derived by this seven-step process are of equal worth and provides no way to resolve values conflicts when two persons arrive at opposed values conclusions after going through the seven steps. Third, there is only sparse research evidence to support the claims made by proponents of values clarification. Finally, critics claim that values clarification is really a form of Rogerian client-centered therapy, and that values clarifiers ought to develop a rationale based on this conclusion rather than on the seven-step process.

Cognitive Moral Development

Cognitive moral development refers to the research and interventions conducted by Kohlberg and his colleagues. They argue that there are six ways to think about moral or civic issues, arranged in stages (Figure 1). Persons pass through these stages of thought, beginning at Stage 1, in invariant sequence, although their thought may be arrested at any stage. Individuals understand arguments at their own stage of thought, at all stages beneath their own, and sometimes at one stage above their own. Hence, typical high school students who think at Stages 2, 3, or 4 do not understand the Stage 5 principles behind the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. A number of educational experiments indicate that stage-development can be facilitated through the discussion of hypothetical or real-life moral dilemmas.

Figure 1

Levels and Stages of Moral Development

THE PRECONVENTIONAL LEVEL (Stages 1 and 2)

At this level, persons consider the power of authority figures or the physical or hedonistic consequences of actions, such as punishment, reward, or exchange of favors. This level has the following stages:

Figure 1 (cont'd)

Stage 1: The Punishment and Obedience Orientation

At this stage, the physical consequences of doing something determine whether it is good or bad, without regard for its human meaning or value. Persons at Stage 1 think about avoiding punishment or earning rewards, and they defer to authority figures with power over them.

Stage 2: The Instrumental Relativist Orientation

At Stage 2, right reasoning leads to action which satisfies one's own needs and sometimes meets the needs of others. Stage 2 thought often involves elements of fairness, but always for pragmatic reasons rather than from a sense of justice or loyalty. Reciprocity, a key element in Stage 2 thought, is a matter of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours."

THE CONVENTIONAL LEVEL (Stages 3 and 4)

Persons at this level value maintaining the expectations of their family, group, or nation for their own sake and regardless of immediate consequences. Persons at the conventional level show loyalty to the social order and actively maintain, support, and justify it. This level has the following two stages:

Stage 3: The Interpersonal Sharing Orientation

At this stage, persons equate good behavior with whatever pleases or helps others and with what others approve of. Stage 3 persons often conform to stereotypical ideas of how the majority of persons in their group behave. They often judge behavior by intentions, and they earn approval by being "nice."

Stage 4: The Societal Maintenance Orientation

Stage 4 thought orients toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behavior con-

Figure 1 (cont'd)

sists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, or maintaining the given social order for its own sake.

THE PRINCIPLED LEVEL (Stages 5 and 6)

At this level, persons reason according to moral principles which have validity apart from the authority of groups to which they belong. This level has the following two stages:

Stage 5: The Social Contract, Human Rights, and Welfare Orientation

Persons at Stage 5 tend to define right action in terms of general individual rights and standards which have been examined critically and agreed upon by the society in a document such as the Declaration of Independence. Stage 5 persons stress the legal point of view, but they emphasize the possibility of changing laws after rational consideration of the welfare of the society. Free agreement and contract bind persons together where no laws apply.

Stage 6: The Universal Ethical-Principle Orientation

At Stage 6, persons define the right by the decision of their conscience guided by ethical principles such as respect for human personality, liberty compatible with the equal liberty of all others, justice, and equality. These principles appeal to logical comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency. Instead of being concrete rules, they are abstract ethical principles.

Moral discussions take place in two forms. The more established technique presents students with a hypothetical moral dilemma which involves a conflict between two or more moral issues, e.g., the value of life and the necessity to obey the law or to respect authority. For example, one of Kohlberg's classic dilemmas focuses on the issue of whether

a husband should steal a drug to save his dying wife if he has no other way to get the drug. Students discuss what the protagonist in the dilemma should do, concentrating on the reasoning for supporting a particular stand. These discussions take place either in separate courses devoted to moral development or as part of social studies or literature courses, where the dilemmas can grow out of the subject matter. The other form of discussion focuses on real-life student dilemmas which are discussed as students decide issues which arise in self-governing units set up within a wider high school. Students and staff draw up and enforce rules to govern themselves. Moral discussions take place as the participants make rules and decide what to do about infractions (stealing, disrupting classes, cutting class, using drugs, and so forth).

Moral discussions focus on moral reasoning in an attempt to facilitate stage-change. Until persons can think at the principled stages (Stages 5 and 6), they cannot fully understand the principles behind the nation's fundamental documents. Until they can think at Stage 4, they cannot fully comprehend the societal-maintenance arguments on which a law-and-order interpretation of the Constitution is based. The technique also has secondary objectives. Properly conducted, moral discussions and participatory governments attempt to enhance self-esteem, teach knowledge of basic civic concepts such as justice or law, and encourage the development of democratic values attained at Stages 5 and 6.

Critics of cognitive moral development identify a number of problems with the approach. Chief among these are the following. First, they argue that moral discussions can be repetitious and will bore students if used to excess. Second, they point out that everyone does not accept the universality of the stages of thought, and they further argue that some of

the research about the stages is questionable. Third, they point to the difficulties of training typical classroom teachers unfamiliar with developmental psychology to conduct moral discussions. Finally, they point to the fact that few materials for either teachers or students have been published, although many more will appear in the fall of 1976.

Alternative Educational Programs

Alternative educational programs refer to the wide variety of free schools, schools-within-schools, schemes for de-schooling society, and alternative educational programs within conventional school settings which have become popular since the end of World War II. These programs developed in response to critics of traditional education who argued that conventional schools had failed to meet the needs of many students. The problem was so severe, these critics argued, that only a wholesale reorganization of schooling could bring about the necessary reforms.

Alternative educational programs are not exclusively focused on values education or on citizenship education, of course. Yet values and citizenship play a large part in the goals, courses, and administrative arrangements of these programs. Leaders of many alternative schools hope to improve students' attitudes toward school, so that they will find the educational program interesting and worthwhile. They have used techniques such as values clarification widely. But the major effect of these programs on values has been in the changes in organizational structure. Administrators and teachers give students in many alternative schools a genuine voice in decision-making about matters such as school government, the curriculum, and the hiring and firing of teachers. These changes alter the relationships of faculty and administration to students and give students the sort of responsibilities that citizens in a democracy later face as full participants in civic life.

Many alternative educational programs -- as well as some

programs within conventional educational settings -- place students in positions of responsibility in the wider community. Students serve as interns in civic agencies, work on jobs as part of a work-study program, or take other parts of their educational programs outside the school walls. Like the alternative educational programs within schools, these out-of-school programs change the hidden curriculum in dramatic ways, and these changes must affect students' values.

Critics of alternative education point to several shortcomings. First, it applies to only a small percentage of school students because it demands such far-reaching changes in educational programs. Second, many alternative programs fail after a few years, primarily because they are poorly financed and supported or because key members of the staff "burn out." Third, many of the programs do not stress basic skills, partly because students with a voice in curricular decision-making choose esoteric subjects to pursue at the expense of traditional reading, writing, mathematics, and citizenship skills. Finally, many attempts in alternative schools to share decision-making with students have failed, partly because many students do not want to take responsibility for tough decisions involving peers.

Values Programs and Citizenship Goals

How do the four values programs described in the second section of this paper relate to the six citizenship goals described in the first part? What aspects of education for citizenship are unrelated to these four values programs? The third part of this paper addresses these questions.

Values Programs and Participatory Skills

None of the four values programs discussed makes a serious attempt to teach the first two participatory skills, reading and writing. All four, of course, involve both reading and

writing exercises from time to time, but none makes improvement in these skills a major part of their goals. On the other hand, all four stress listening and speaking skills when they are properly conducted. All involve discussion and a considerable amount of student-to-student interaction. But the degree to which this requirement influences teachers to pay explicit attention to the improvement of speaking and listening skills is more a function of the individual teacher than of the values program involved.

Two of the programs attempt to give students direct experience in taking part in meetings and in assuming leadership positions in organizations. The participatory governments developed by proponents of cognitive moral development are organized around small group meetings which involve one staff member and a dozen or so students, and around town meetings which bring together all the staff and students in a unit (typically 60 or 70 persons) to conduct business. This type of organization provides direct experience with committees and the democratic process, but it does not help students learn about representative democracy. Some alternative educational programs also utilize the town-meeting format, and some set up representatives systems. And a subset of alternative programs gets at ways to influence decision-makers through pressure groups or other forms of citizen action.

In general, none of the values-education programs takes participatory skills seriously enough. Each has its own values focus and its own set of pedagogical techniques. All of them, however, can be adapted to stress the development of participatory skills by creative teachers interested in citizenship education who have the time and resources to think the problem through and to develop techniques designed to improve skills rather than only to utilize existing ones. The development

of programs to improve participatory skills both within and separate from values programs would serve a vital educational need if funding were available.

Values Programs and Intellectual Skills

Three values-education programs have particular relevance for the development of intellectual skills: cognitive moral development, values analysis, and values clarification. None of the three does a very good job. Intellectual skills such as those previously described require full formal operational thought on the Piagetian scale. No values-education program tries explicitly to develop full formal operational thought in any systematic and rigorous way. But these three values programs may facilitate the development of formal thought incidentally. All three ask students to identify problems, to pose alternative solutions, to trace the effects of these solutions, to gather data, and to come to conclusions. This style of thinking differs radically from recitation and lecture, still the predominant teaching styles in American schools. Perhaps these values programs will lead to more formal thinking among school students, but we have no hard research data to support such a conclusion.

A program of citizenship education ought to take this problem seriously. Doing so will require the development of entire curricula in many subjects throughout the years of schooling. Cognitive development must be made a primary rather than an incidental goal -- and we know surprisingly little about ways to facilitate the development of formal operational thought. Here the society clearly needs money to support research.

In the meantime, values programs (such as values analysis) which assume that students can think in formal operational terms may have an incidental negative effect on self-esteem.

Students who cannot follow the arguments in a session involving values analysis may correctly conclude that they cannot do the work their teachers demand, leading to damaged self-esteem. Neither values clarification nor cognitive moral development faces this danger to the same degree as does values analysis because the former two programs provide opportunities for reasonable responses by students who think at either concrete operational or early formal operational thought. By doing so, they may incidentally facilitate the development of the thought patterns which values analyzers presuppose.

In general, no values-education program makes an optimal contribution to the development of the intellectual skills demanded by full citizenship in a democratic society. But they probably do a better job in this area than recitation teaching or lecturing.

Values Programs and Knowledge

None of the values programs speaks to the kinds of knowledge about political, economic, and social affairs essential for a full understanding of the way in which our society functions. None provides guidance about what aspects of the social sciences should be included in the school program. This failure alone sharply distinguishes values education from citizenship education.

One of the programs, cognitive moral development, does speak to the knowledge issue, but in a different way than through the selection of content. Before persons can understand knowledge of our society meaningfully, they must reach at least Stage 4, and preferably Stage 5, on the Kohlberg scale. At Stage 4, persons have a full societal perspective, so that they are able to take the viewpoint of others far removed in space, time, or particular circumstances (Figure 2). This perspective is a prerequisite to knowledge of how the society

functions. Similarly, at Stage 4, thought about civic or moral issues opens the way to an understanding of the function of law in the society that a thinker at Stage 3 cannot comprehend. Finally, since persons define concepts such as law or justice in stage-related terms, they must reach Stage 4 thought in order to be able to acquire knowledge of the definition of concepts which will accord with the definitions used by social scientists.

Figure 2

Levels and Stages of Perspective-Taking

THE PRECONVENTIONAL LEVEL (Stages 1 and 2)

At this level, persons have the perspective of isolated individuals rather than of those who belong to a group or social system. This level has the following two stages:

Stage 1

At this stage, persons focus only on their own interests and do not think of themselves as persons with responsibilities to others or as persons who belong to a group.

Stage 2

At this stage, persons still want to serve their own interests but are able to anticipate another person's reactions. Here there is willingness to make a deal to get what one wants.

THE CONVENTIONAL LEVEL (Stages 3 and 4)

At this level, persons assume the perspective of members of a group or of a society. This level has the following two stages:

Stage 3

At Stage 3, persons can see things from the point of view of shared relationships, such as caring, trust, and respect, between two or more individuals who know each other.

Figure 2 (cont'd)

Stage 4

Here persons can take the point of view of members of a social system or of society as a whole. Persons are able to see a situation through the eyes of many actors, including persons in the society whom they do not know.

THE PRINCIPLED LEVEL (Stages 5 and 6)

At this level, the perspective is prior to society. It is the perspective of individuals who have made the moral commitments on which a good society must be based. This perspective establishes standards by which a particular society may be judged and by which persons may rationally commit themselves to societal membership. This level also has two stages, but the distinctions between them are subtle ones which do not affect work in the schools.

All four of the values programs teach knowledge incidentally. They teach facts, generalizations, and concepts. They also teach knowledge of a process of thought and of decision-making. But citizenship education is far too vital a matter for American society to be left to the mercy of incidental knowledge. We need funds to help scholars identify knowledge essential for citizenship and funds to help us learn how to facilitate the development of higher stages of thought about civic and moral problems.

Values Programs and Personal Development

Of the four values programs discussed in this paper, values clarification offers the most promise for personal development.

Many values-clarification exercises mix together questions involving moral issues, issues of personal preference, and public-policy problems with techniques for improving self-knowledge and enhancing self-esteem. With careful editing -- which the proponents of values clarification recommend in their books -- exercises can be developed which contribute to a single goal such as self-knowledge. Many students seldom articulate their judgments about what they think, because no one asks them to do so. Nor are they sometimes able to list their best qualities or to explain clearly why they think themselves worthy. Values-clarification exercises can help them gain self-knowledge and learn to recognize their strengths and weaknesses. We should support programs of personal development based partly on values clarification and designed specifically to enhance self-knowledge and self-esteem.

Self-discovery can also take place as incidental learning in the other three forms of values education discussed in this paper. Properly led, so that discussions focus around the contributions of students, moral discussions can leave students feeling that they have made a significant contribution to a class by making a comment which their teacher or peers picked up as a focal point for discussion. Students who think at full formal operational thought can have similar experiences in values-analysis classes. Both the participatory governments advocated as a part of moral-development programs, and the governmental structures and close relationship with faculty which mark the climate of many alternative schools, can also contribute to self-esteem and self-knowledge.

None of the four values programs contributes significantly to the third dimension of personal development -- identification with one's family, peer group, racial or ethnic group, religious tradition, nation, and the common heritage of humankind.

This identification can be fostered by encouraging students to write family, ethnic, religious, or community histories and by making such topics the core of experiences in parts of history courses. Personal identification should form a key part of citizenship education in a period in our history when so many are alienated from the government and the society which it represents. Educators need support in this endeavor.

Values Programs and the Development of Democratic Values

Of the four values programs, cognitive moral development has the best claim as a system which helps to develop specifically democratic values based on principles enumerated in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution: justice, the dignity and worth of the individual, equality, liberty commensurate with the equal liberty of all others, and the greatest good for the greatest number. These principles undergird thought at Stages 5 and 6 on the Kohlberg scale. Students choose these principles to guide their thought only after they have passed successively through each of the earlier stages on the scale. Few high school students ever reach Stage 5; they leave school thinking primarily at Stage 4 or Stage 3 -- the two stages which also characterize the thought patterns of most American adults. Many educators would be delighted if all students could be brought to Stage 4 thought, a stage which stresses societal maintenance through obeying the laws which all of us have made through the democratic process as the most reasonable way to secure liberty and freedom. We need support in order to launch programs directed toward this goad.

Values clarification accepts the relativity of values. So long as values have been derived through the seven-step process described by values clarifiers, one value is as good as another. It is possible, theoretically, for persons to choose undemocratic values as the end result of the seven-step process. But if

Many values-clarification exercises mix together questions involving moral issues, issues of personal preference, and public-policy problems with techniques for improving self-knowledge and enhancing self-esteem. With careful editing -- which the proponents of values clarification recommend in their books -- exercises can be developed which contribute to a single goal such as self-knowledge. Many students seldom articulate their judgments about what they think, because no one asks them to do so. Nor are they sometimes able to list their best qualities or to explain clearly why they think themselves worthy. Values-clarification exercises can help them gain self-knowledge and learn to recognize their strengths and weaknesses. We should support programs of personal development based partly on values clarification and designed specifically to enhance self-knowledge and self-esteem.

Self-discovery can also take place as incidental learning in the other three forms of values education discussed in this paper. Properly led, so that discussions focus around the contributions of students, moral discussions can leave students feeling that they have made a significant contribution to a class by making a comment which their teacher or peers picked up as a focal point for discussion. Students who think at full formal operational thought can have similar experiences in values-analysis classes. Both the participatory governments advocated as a part of moral-development programs, and the governmental structures and close relationship with faculty which mark the climate of many alternative schools, can also contribute to self-esteem and self-knowledge.

None of the four values programs contributes significantly to the third dimension of personal development -- identification with one's family, peer group, racial or ethnic group, religious tradition, nation, and the common heritage of humankind.

This identification can be fostered by encouraging students to write family, ethnic, religious, or community histories and by making such topics the core of experiences in parts of history courses. Personal identification should form a key part of citizenship education in a period in our history when so many are alienated from the government and the society which it represents. Educators need support in this endeavor.

Values Programs and the Development of Democratic Values

Of the four values programs, cognitive moral development has the best claim as a system which helps to develop specifically democratic values based on principles enumerated in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution: justice, the dignity and worth of the individual, equality, liberty commensurate with the equal liberty of all others, and the greatest good for the greatest number. These principles undergird thought at Stages 5 and 6 on the Kohlberg scale. Students choose these principles to guide their thought only after they have passed successively through each of the earlier stages on the scale. Few high school students ever reach Stage 5; they leave school thinking primarily at Stage 4 or Stage 3 -- the two stages which also characterize the thought patterns of most American adults. Many educators would be delighted if all students could be brought to Stage 4 thought, a stage which stresses societal maintenance through obeying the laws which all of us have made through the democratic process as the most reasonable way to secure liberty and freedom. We need support in order to launch programs directed toward this goad.

Values clarification accepts the relativity of values. So long as values have been derived through the seven-step process described by values clarifiers, one value is as good as another. It is possible, theoretically, for persons to choose undemocratic values as the end result of the seven-step process. But if

values clarifiers would stress personal development and eliminate moral issues from their exercises, they would sidestep the values-relativity issue.

Values analysis does not focus so much on the development of values as it does on the role of values in personal decision-making. As persons examine values in the process of making decisions, however, they are exposed to new values positions which may cause their values to change. If they do change in a more democratic direction, the change represents incidental learning. It would be useful to learn whether values-analysis exercises produce stage-change on the Kohlberg scale. Funds are required to generate this knowledge.

Participating in community meetings, either in alternative schools or as a part of a program in cognitive moral development centered on a participatory governmental structure, should promote the development of democratic values through the hidden curriculum. Students learn about equality and about the dignity and worth of the individual because each person, staff member and student alike, has equal rights and casts one vote in decisions. They search for just solutions to the everyday problems of the school so that justice may become a part of their thinking. They learn that to achieve personal freedom, they must recognize the equal freedom of the other members of the community. Finally, the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number plays a large part in the deliberations of students in community meetings.

Developing democratic values will not necessarily lead to a greater amount of moral action, however. Belief is one thing, action another. Several variables in addition to one's values influence how one acts in a particular situation -- whether a moral issue is clear, whether one acts alone or in concert with others, whether there is situational stress, and whether one

has a strong enough ego to act on principles even when others act in different ways. The belief that new programs of moral or values education will automatically affect behavior in such a way as to prevent future race riots, Vietnams, or Watergates has no research basis in the social sciences. Improving citizenship in a democracy will require much more than spending a little more money for values-education programs in the schools -- although such an expenditure would help. For example, additional funding would help us to learn more about the relationship of thought and action.

Values Programs and Citizenship Action

The most widespread and effective programs of citizenship action are not part of the four values programs discussed in this paper. Instead, they are programs specifically designed to foster good citizenship and to make education more relevant to students by relating it to work experience or to community action. Some of these action projects might be improved if they utilized ideas from the values projects. Clearly, citizen action and values education are complementary programs which should reinforce each other. Several proposed citizenship-action programs have been unable to obtain adequate funding. They should be funded if the society expects to make progress in this promising direction.

Organizing Programs of Citizenship Education

In this paper I have suggested a number of areas where funding is required in both values education and citizenship education. Other members of the profession would probably suggest different or additional funding needs for specific research or intervention efforts. At the same time that these separate efforts are taking place, the society should establish several centers, each authorized to develop a full program of

citizenship education. These comprehensive citizenship-education programs should have six interrelated elements.

First, they should extend over many years of schooling. Students attain the six sets of goals specified in this paper slowly. No minicourse, no one-semester course, no 1-year course will do the job. Instead, citizenship objectives must be worked into the entire curriculum throughout the full range of schooling if the society expects to reach these goals to the greatest possible degree.

Second, a comprehensive program of citizenship education must extend well beyond the social studies courses, the traditional home of civic education. Every discipline in the school can enhance personal development. Every discipline can facilitate the development of formal operational thought. The entire instructional staff can make participatory skills an explicit curriculum goal. Reading teachers and writing teachers can also play a vital role. Citizenship education is far too vital a matter to be left exclusively in the realm of the twelfth-grade government course.

Third, a comprehensive program of citizenship education must change the hidden curriculum as well as the overt curriculum. The hidden curriculum involves all the instructional and administrative arrangements from which students learn in school. These arrangements include the ways in which teachers conduct classes; the ways in which teachers and administrators use their power to sanction or praise; and the ways in which the sheer size of large, impersonal schools affect student learning. In many schools, the hidden curriculum denies what the students learn in their formal classes. Student governments lack the power that elected bodies possess (according to the civics textbooks). School rules are made autocratically instead of through the democratic process studied in government

class. These conditions emphasize the importance of change in school-governance structures if full programs of citizenship preparation are to succeed.

Fourth, a comprehensive program of citizenship education must include an intensive, long-term teacher-preparation program. Traditional teachers will have much to learn -- and to unlearn -- in order to become effective citizenship educators. They must learn to encompass new objectives in their traditional lists of goals. They must assimilate new teaching techniques. They must absorb a new philosophy based on research which many teachers know next to nothing about. And they must learn to relinquish some of their traditional power to community meetings where each person -- teacher and student alike -- has one vote. These requirements suggest in-service work extending over several years as comprehensive citizenship-education programs evolve, and they suggest programs which cut across department lines and include teachers, counselors, administrators, and parents.

Fifth, a comprehensive citizenship-education program requires new curricular materials organized for citizenship goals, particularly in social studies and English. These new materials should provide sequential and cumulative learning experiences throughout the student's school career. Although these curricula do not now exist, a psychological, philosophical, and educational rationale for them is at hand. In addition, a large number of curriculum artifacts developed by the curriculum projects of the 1960s and 1970s can be adapted to the needs of citizenship education.

Finally, a comprehensive program of citizenship education must be evaluated carefully. This evaluation should extend to all six sets of goals outlined in the first section of this paper. A truly comprehensive evaluation will follow samples of students well beyond their high school careers. Citizenship

education can be proclaimed successful only if the students who participate in it become more effective citizens than those who do not.

References

Raths, L., Harmin, M., & Simons, S. Values and teaching. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1969.

Ubbelohde, C., & Fraenkel, J. (Eds.). Value of the American heritage: Challenges, case studies, and teaching strategies. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1976.